

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WATER RESOURCES  
DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. JOE SCARBOROUGH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 30, 1996*

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 which is being considered under suspension of the rules. It is my hope that my colleagues will support this bill and that it will be conferred soon and sent to the President for his prompt signature.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend Chairman SHUSTER and his staff for their work on behalf of a very important project in my district. As my colleagues are aware, last year's hurricane season was especially rough on the beaches of the Florida Panhandle. We took direct hits from two major storms, Hurricanes Opal and Erin. Major damage was inflicted on northwest Florida with the most severe destruction appearing along the beautiful beaches of the Gulf of Mexico.

Panama City Beach sustained a considerable amount of damage to structures along the beach as well as to the beach itself. Since before 1970, Panama City Beach has suffered damage due to storms and erosion, a significant portion due to federally sponsored activities. In October 1995, Hurricane Opal aggravated the deterioration of the beach significantly by washing away millions of cubic yards of sand and destroying over 1,000 homes and exposing upland development to damage from future storms.

The community has been seeking Federal help since 1970 but has yet to see a single dollar. It has, however, received the commitment of over \$10 million from the State of Florida as well as the commitment of local funds. Unfortunately, as of yet, the Federal share has not been appropriated even though the project meets all the criteria for Federal assistance.

However, through this bill, we were able to make this project eligible for Federal reimbursement through project modification language. This will give the community a much-needed opportunity to proceed with the project without waiting any longer for the Federal share. The residents of this coastal community cannot afford to wait another year to begin this essential beach protection project. However, it is my sincerest wish that the Panama City Beach project will receive its Federal share as soon as possible to help the community's efforts.

On behalf of the people of Panama City and its surrounding communities, I would like to thank the chairman for his work on this very important piece of legislation.

## SPEAKING IN THE AFFIRMATIVE

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 31, 1996*

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, according to a recent report prepared by the American Council on Education [ACE], "Students of color have posted significant gains in college enrollment and the number of degrees they earned in recent years." However, the report warns that "this progress is threatened by attacks on the use of affirmative action policies in higher education."

Clearly, affirmative action policies that increase the opportunities to obtain secondary education for those who without them will remain unprepared to meet out Nation's challenges must continue to play a key and significant role. Now there are those affirmative action opponents who take delight in pointing out the most inconsequential problems with such policies; but shamefully close their eyes to the great strides they have made toward better educating our national populace.

Recalling for a moment may reference to the ACE report on affirmative action, we see that denying educational opportunities to the neediest is wrong. It is wrong morally. It is ethically wrong. It is the wrong path for this country to take if America is serious about remaining one of the most enlightened and better educated societies on the planet Earth.

Perhaps an economic illustration will better serve my arguments for affirmative action. It is empirically factual that denying educational opportunities negates potential economic benefits for the country. According to findings prepared by Dr. Andrew Sum, Northeastern University, Center for Labor Market Studies, and the McIntosh Commission, personal economic benefits from obtaining a 4-year college degree has increased substantially over the past two decades.

The fundamental shifts in the earnings capacity of workers with varying years of formal schooling can be seen most starkly in the earnings experiences of young adult males 20 to 29 years old in the United States over the 1973-92 period.

The year 1973 is an important year because it marks the great economic divide in the American post-World War II era. During that year the real, or the inflation-adjusted mean annual earnings of all 20 to 29-year-old men in the United States were equivalent to earnings totalling \$23,522 in 1992; but, by the year 1992, the mean earnings of men in this age group had declined to \$16,715—a reduction of nearly 29 percent.

While young men in each educational attainment subgroup, without diplomas, with diplomas, and the college graduates, experienced a deterioration in their real earnings position over this time period, the relative size of these declines varied widely by years of completed formal schooling, and cognate opportunities available for growth.

When we look at the real annual earnings we see this more clearly: those who failed to obtain a high school diploma fell nearly 42 percent; for high school graduates by 32 percent, and by holders of a bachelor's degree by just 5 percent. While the mean annual earnings advantage of young male college graduates over that of high school graduates was 15 percent in 1973, the relative size of this earnings advantage had risen to nearly 62 percent by 1992. This is significant on several levels, the least of which illustrates just how deeply divided economically the country has become when an imbalance of opportunities prevails.

Both young black and white men with only high school diplomas have lost considerable economic ground during the past two decades. As a consequence, the earnings advantages of young male college graduates widened to a substantial degree, increasing from 15 percent in 1973 to 62 percent in 1992.

This is precisely what must be understood. Denying individuals an opportunity to attend college or graduate school in the 1990's has considerably greater personal economic consequences that it would have had two decades ago. This is the threat alluded to by the American Council on Education. It is a real treat. It is a threat we should not treat lightly.

Now you may ask, "just who are the beneficiaries of Affirmative Action?" I believe they are America's poor, its forgotten, its disadvantaged. I believe that it is America's mosaic melting pot of people all linked by opportunities denied.

Therefore, instead of wasting our time undermining educational programs that have worked, we should be seeking ways in which to enhance them and thus grant greater opportunities for educationally and economically disadvantaged Americans. My Republican colleagues need to understand that the lack of educational opportunity, entrepreneurial and business growth, heavily contributes to the problems of crime, drug trafficking, hopelessness, and overall poverty.

It is ironic that at the same time the Republicans in Congress are moving forward with their attack an affirmative action, they are also madly swinging their budget axe to chop down all of the programs that work to alleviate these crises, programs such as those for Head Start, child nutrition and school lunch, job training initiatives, student loans, COPS funding, public housing assistance, and so on. This is shortsightedness at its highest level.

CONTINUATION OF TRIBUTE TO  
HAMILTON FISH

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 25, 1996*

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a beloved Congress-

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.